

## REMARKS

Applicant submits hereby drawings 1-4 to illustrate the hand-massaging device. The drawings do not add any new matter. The drawings illustrate the embodiment described in the specification, where the device is a ball.

4. Examiner objected the claims as they were numbered with roman numerals. Applicant has corrected the numbering as required.

5-6. Examiner rejected claims I-IX under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant submits drawings 1-4 to overcome this rejection. The drawings illustrate the embodiment where the device is a ball. This embodiment is described in the specification and therefore the newly submitted drawings do not add any new matter. Accordingly, the applicant claims the ball for use of hand massage. Applicant believes that the amended claims are enabled by the specification. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection in view of the preceding amendments.

7. Claims I-X are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Examiner states that Claim I is unclear as to what is the structural relationship between the hand held object and the inflatable device. Claim I has been amended to overcome this rejection.

Examiner states that claim V is unclear. Claim V has been canceled.

Examiner states that claims VI and VII are unclear. Claims Vi and VII are canceled.

Examiner states that in the claims IX and X, "it" is not clear. The claims have been amended to overcome this rejection.

Examiner states that in claim XI "the surface" lacks antecedent basis. The claim has been amended to overcome this rejection.

8. Claims I, III-VIII, and XI are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mann. Examiner states that Mann teaches a therapeutic device having an inflatable ball and a valve.

Claims III-VII are canceled. Claim I has been amended to clearly distinguish it from Mann.

The invention of the applicant is not anticipated by Mann, because the device of Mann is to be used by stroke and arthritis patients. This means that the device of Mann is to be used to therapeutic use for persons that have lost their ability to move their palm/fingers. This is clear from column I lines 40-42 where Mann writes: "...device.. is easily applied under the patient's fingers between the finger tips and the palmer region of the hand." In Fig. 4 and 5 Mann shows how the originally flat device is inserted under the fingers of the patient the fingers are moved outward by inflating the ball.

The device according to the present disclosure is a ball; the ball is inflatable and deflatable, but not during the treatment as the device of Mann. The ball according to the present invention can be inflated to a convenient pressure before using it as a therapeutic device. The claim 1 has been amended to make this clear. The therapeutic use of this ball is to softly squeeze the earlier deflated or inflated ball. This is clearly different from the use of the device of Mann, where a deflated device is inflated during the therapy to move the fingers of a patient that has an impaired capability to move his/her fingers otherwise.

Applicant respectfully request Examiner to reconsider this rejection in view of the preceding explanation and amendments in the claims.

10. Examiner rejects claims II, IX, and X under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mann. Claim II is canceled. Regarding claims IX and X, applicant believes that the amendment of independent claim 1 makes the claims 9 and 10 also allowable.

11. Examiner cites Phillips, Obermaier, Ostrowski, Myers et al and Stern to show different exercise devices according to the prior art. Applicant has carefully reviewed these publications and believes that his invention is patentable over the prior art presented in these publications.

Phillips discloses a wrist support and therapeutic hand exercises consisting of bladder filled with tiny glass spheres. This disclosure does not give an opportunity to change the pressure of the device, which is one key element of the invention of the applicant.

Obermaier discloses a foot massage apparatus consisting of two cushions filled with fluid. This device is for foot massage to be used either by sitting or by standing. The apparatus is not related to hand massaging.

Ostrowski discloses an inflatable recreational ball. This ball is meant to be used as a punch ball. This invention is not related to the art of hand massaging devices.

Myers and al. discloses an exercise device comprising a large diameter ball having a pair of handles. This invention is not related to the art of hand massaging devices.

Stern discloses an inflatable hand orthosis consisting of an inflatable air bladder. Similarly as the invention disclosed by Mann this device is placed on the palm under the fingers when in deflated state and then inflated. The inflation will then move the fingers. This idea is different from the invention according to the present disclosure where the ball is inflated to desired pressure before using it as a therapeutic massaging device.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that the amended claims should now be in condition for allowance.  
Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Yours truly;

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "John Dodds".

John Dodds

Attorney of the Applicant

Reg. No. 44533

cc. File

Mr. Streeter